



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/721,894	11/25/2000	Kia Silverbrook	NPA061US	4082
24011	7590	11/07/2005	EXAMINER	
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD 393 DARLING STREET BALMAIN, 2041 AUSTRALIA			HUYNH, THU V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/721,894	SILVERBROOK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thu V. Huynh	2178	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☒ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 5-16.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended limitations to independent claims 1 and 7 would necessitate further search and/or consideration..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants argue that "Examiner appears to have rejected the above specific limitations of claim 1 by inaccurately and inappropriately paraphrasing the limitations", such as "the computer system associates the location coordinates of each tag with at least some of the graphic data".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner does not paraphrase such limitations because such limitations include in the claims 1 as filed on 05/08/05 by the applicants for examiner exams.

Applicants argue that "Dymetman et al, Cooperman et al clearly do not disclose or suggest associating at the time of printing the type and spatial extent of each tag of coded data with the spatial extent of at least some graphic data"

Examiner notes that such limitations do not include in the claim as filed on 05/08/05 by the applicants for examiner exams.

Applicants argue that "the limitations of the present claims do not recite mere association of visible graphic data and invisible coded data; rather, the claims recites "at the time of printing the computer system associates the coded data with a description of the graphic data".

Such association at the time of printing is clearly not taught in Cooperman et al"

Examiner notes that such limitations do not include in the claim as filed on 05/08/05 by the applicants for examiner exams.

Applicants argue that "Wright et al do not disclose associating the spatial extent of invisible coded data with the spatial extent of visible graphic data"

Examiner notes that such "spatial extent of invisible coded data with the spatial extent of visible graphic data" do not include in the claim as filed on 05/08/05 by the applicants for examiner exams. However, as taught by Wright, visible graphic data and coded data (visible or invisible) is printed at the same time by the same printer (Wright, col.12, lines 47-64; col.13, lines 23-31; a printer with two ink ribbons to print invisible coded data and visible information on a paper after a print command). Wright teaches after a print command is issued, the printer prints coded marks in invisible ink and then print the visible postmark information. Wright's teaching does not require the user issues two print commands to print invisible coded marks and visible information. It is noted that printing graphic images and coded data at the same time does not require to printing graphic images and coded data simultaneously, since simultaneously printing is not claimed. Therefore, Wright's teaching perfectly matches the limitation of printing coded data and visible data at the same time by the same printer so that such data is associated as claimed.

Applicants argue that "it is improper to combine references"

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Cooperman teaches "the document is a blank coded substrate or substrate having human-readable information printed thereon" (Cooperman, col.8, lines 17-18) and "components of a document printed on a coded substrate" (Cooperman, col.3, lines 38-39). These suggests that the human readable information (graphic data) is printed on the coded substrate (invisible coded data). Wright teaches visible graphic data and coded data (visible or invisible) is printed at the same time by the same printer (Wright, col.12, lines 47-64; col.13, lines 23-31; a printer with two ink ribbons to print invisible coded data and visible information on a paper after a print command). Therefore, the combination of Wright and Cooperman is proper.

Applicants argue that "the present invention teaches making such associations before receiving any such user interaction", such as the printed pager pages are netpage stored on the netpage network, describes the type and zone of each text field or button.

Examiner notes that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).